

Remarks

I. Status of the claims

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

By the foregoing amendments to the claims, claims 47-51, 58-64 and 103-106 are pending in the application, with claims 47, 58, 62 and 63 being the independent claims. Applicants have amended claims 48 and 50 to remove dependency from the rejected claim 11, which is now cancelled, and so claims 48-51 now depend ultimately only from claim 47, which was considered allowable. Claim 104 has been amended to cancel dependency from cancelled claim 101, and to be dependent from allowed claim 103. These amendments introduce no new matter and their reconsideration and entry are respectfully requested.

II. Summary of the Office Action

In the Office Action dated February 16, 2006 ("the Office Action"), claims 1, 2, 11, 13-42 and 44-106 were pending. At page 2 of the Office Action the Examiner has rejected claims 26-28, 30, 81-83 and 85 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. At pages 2-3 of the Office Action the Examiner has issued an obviousness-type double patenting rejection over claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,932,971, and issued provisional obviousness type double patenting rejections over claims of copending U.S. Application Nos. 10/289,456, 10/289,454, 10/243,739 and 10/264,267. At page 3 of the Office Action the Examiner has indicated that claims 47, 58-64 and 103-106 are allowed.

III. All bases of rejection have been rendered moot or overcome by cancellation or amendment of the claims

Applicants thank the Examiner for allowance of claims 47, 58-64 and 103-106. However, claims pending claims 1, 2, 11, 13-42, 44-46, 48-57 and 65-102 remain rejected. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's bases of rejection or provisional rejection. However, solely to advance prosecution, and not in acquiescence to the rejections, Applicants have cancelled claims 1-46, 52-57 and 65-102, rendering moot the rejection of those claims.

Prior to amendment, claims 48-51 depended from claim 47, which is allowed, and claim 11, which has been provisionally rejected under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims of copending U.S. Application No. 10/243,739. The Examiner has not issued any additional rejections of claims 48-51. Applicants therefore believe that the rejection of claims 48-51 was due solely to their dependence from claim 11. Claims 48 and 50 have been amended such that claims 48-51 now depend ultimately only from allowed claim 47. Applicants respectfully believe that they have removed the basis of the rejection of claims 48-51 and that claims 48-51 are now therefore allowable. Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of claims 48-51, thus allowing all pending claims.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance or appeal. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Simon J. Elliott, Ph.D.
Agent for Applicants
Registration No. 54,083

Date: April 3, 2006

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 772-8610

501160_1.DOC